IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
APPELLATE SIDE

CRIMINAL APPLICATION NO. 66 OF 2007
IN
CRIMINAL REVISION APPLICATION NO. 401 OF 2001

Rais Ahmed Ibrahim Saheb Shaikh. ... Applicant.

V/s.

The State of Maharashtra. ... Respondent.

V.V.Purwant for the applicant.

U.V.Nikam, APP for the State.

CORAM: V.C.DAGA, J.

DATED: 5th October 2007.

P.C.:

. Heard learned counsel for the applicant and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The substantive revision application is directed against the order dated 8th November, 2001 passed below Exh.39 in S.T.C.No.1298/1994 by the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Solapur, whereby the complaint filed by the complainant was restored. On 29th January, 2002, when this matter came up before this Court, nobody had appeared on behalf of applicant. Consequently, revision application came to be dismissed for want of prosecution. Thereafter, it appears that it was restored to file vide order dated

7th February, 2007.

3. The applicant obtained rule in the revision application and interim stay to the impugned order directing disposal of complaint vide order dated 25th June, 2002. Thereafter, the applicant chose to keep the matter under office objections. He did not remove office objections in spite of giving repeated chances.

4. Thereafter, by conditional order dated 19th December, 2005, time to remove office objections was granted. The applicant did not comply with the said order. Again on 7th July, 2006, time was granted to remove office objections. They were not removed. Consequently, revision application got dismissed.

5. Now, by this application, the applicant is seeking to restore the revision application. No sufficient cause is shown as to why office objections were not removed in spite of grant of sufficient time. Looking to the nature of substantive revision application, callous and negligent attitude on part of the applicant to prosecute the present proceeding, justice would be done by dismissing revision application.

6. In the result, revision application is dismissed with no order as to costs.

JUDGE